

**MINUTES OF THE
AUBURN CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
JANUARY 15, 2008**

The regular session of the Auburn City Planning Commission was called to order on January 15, 2008 at 7:10 p.m. by Chairman Merz in the Council Chambers, 1225 Lincoln Way, Auburn, California.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chrm. Merz, Smith, Spokely, Thompson, Worthington

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Wilfred Wong, Community Development Director; Lance Lowe, Associate Planner; Sue Fraizer, Administrative Assistant; Michael Colantuono, City Attorney

ITEM I: CALL TO ORDER

ITEM II: APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the November 6, 2007 meeting were approved as submitted. The minutes of November 20, 2007 meeting were approved as submitted.

ITEM III: ELECTION OF PLANNING COMMISSION OFFICER(S)

Comm. Worthington **MOVED** to Elect Commissioner Smith as Chairman.

Comm. Merz **SECONDED.**

AYES: Merz, Smith, Spokely, Thompson, Worthington

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

Chrm. Smith **MOVED** to Elect Commissioner Worthington as Vice-Chairman.

Comm. Spokely **SECONDED.**

AYES: Merz, Smith, Spokely, Thompson, Worthington

NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

Comm. Thompson **MOVED** to Elect Chrm. Smith as the Traffic Committee representative.

Comm. Worthington **SECONDED**.

AYES: Merz, Smith, Spokely, Thompson, Worthington
NOES: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

Comm. Worthington agreed to serve as the alternate Traffic Committee representative.

Comm. Merz turned the meeting over to newly elected Chairman Smith.

ITEM IV: PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

ITEM V: PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

- A. **Tentative Subdivision Map & Tree Permit - 1120 Lantern View Drive (Auburn Bluffs Subdivision) - Files # SUB 07-3 & TP 07-13.** The request includes a Tentative Subdivision Map to subdivide an approximate ± 9.6 acre parcel into twenty-nine (29) single family residential lots and a Tree Permit to allow the removal of thirty-seven (± 37) native trees located at 1120 Lantern View Drive.

Planner Lowe gave the staff report. The subject property was part of the original Auburn Bluffs planned unit development, which included the Vintage Oaks subdivision. In 1987, there was approval of a 65-unit condominium project on property that included the subject site. 19 of the condominiums were built, the remaining 46 were not. Conditions were added to require view protection for two specific properties located on Humbug Way. This applicant proposes a new project, a single-family residential subdivision; therefore the applicant is not bound by the previous conditions.

A previous proposal for a thirty-three (33) lot Auburn Bluffs project was considered by the Planning Commission on July 18, 2006, and the Planning Commission unanimously denied the proposed Tentative Subdivision Map; Use Permit; and Tree Permit. On July 28, 2006, the applicant appealed the Planning Commission's decision and on September 25, 2006, the City Council considered the appeal. After lengthy discussion, the City Council remanded the project back to the Planning Commission with instructions that the project be revised by the applicant, and treated as a new application.

A new application was filed on March 30, 2007 which addresses many of the issues previously raised at the Planning Commission and City Council meetings. The proposed project will create twenty-nine (29) single-family lots ranging in size from 8,504 square feet to over 47,750 square feet. The concept is to build custom, single-family, multi-story homes with two- and three-car garages. The lots are designed to accommodate homes between 3,500 and 5,500 square feet. A private Architectural Review Committee will be formed to enforce the subdivision's Conditions, Covenants & Restrictions (CC&R's) adopted for the project.

The Bluff-lots (lots 1 through 12) have been modified in response to comments previously provided by the City Council and surrounding residents. Each of the non-cul-de-sac Bluff-lots (lots 1-10) is now a minimum of 60 feet wide, exceeding the 50-foot lot width required of the R-1.8.5 district. The 29-lot layout results in the increase of the width and the side setbacks of the Bluff-lots. The side setbacks have increased from 5 feet on each side to 7.5 feet on each side, resulting in a minimum, 15-foot-aggregate side-yard setback.

Staff has included a condition of approval that the development of the Bluff-lots will limit the placement of the dwellings and related construction activities to within 120 feet of the Lantern View Drive right-of-way (measured from the back of sidewalk). The building envelopes, height limitations, and other conditions imposed provide a buffer, thereby reducing visual impacts on the Vintage Oaks subdivision to the south and west.

Several conditions have been included that address height restrictions. In no case shall the building height exceed 24 feet above the average elevation of the sidewalk. The rear of the lots will be a maximum of 45 feet.

Certain conditions on the rear of the lots require articulation for balconies and wall offsets. The rear balconies will be restricted to a height of 25 feet.

The Bluff-lot homes will be constructed using piles, and stem walls to accommodate the steep slope. "Daylight" or "Tahoe" style basements may be incorporated to accommodate the steep slope. The tiered construction will require grading to enable foundations to be "keyed" into the hillside. A requirement has been added that retaining walls are not to exceed 6 feet in height. The retaining walls may be stepped down with a minimum of 5 feet in separation.

To ensure that the conditions and CC&R's are enforced, the applicant has agreed to establish an Architectural Review Committee.

Planner Lowe provided further details of the proposal, including access, utilities, grading and retaining walls, fencing, landscaping and signage, lighting and drainage.

A tree permit will be required for this project. Planner Lowe provided details of the proposed removal of trees.

The City has prepared an Environmental Review and Checklist. Based on that review and analysis, over 90 mitigation measures have been imposed on the project to ensure that all resource areas will be reduced to less than significant levels.

Some correspondence has been received. A table is provided in the staff report indicating who raised comments and what the comments were, as well as a corresponding staff response and corresponding condition of approval to address each concern.

Staff recommends approval of this project with the included conditions of approval.

Comm. Spokely asked if the original proposed 19 condominiums were constructed, as well as the infrastructure for the remaining condominiums.

Planner Lowe replied that this is correct.

Comm. Spokely asked if the 24-foot street width is a concern of the fire department.

Planner Lowe replied that the fire department has no concern with the street widths.

Comm. Spokely asked from what point the height limitation of 45 feet is measured, before or after grading.

Planner Lowe replied that the 45-foot measurement is after grading is performed. He showed an exhibit and explained that the 45 feet is meant to minimize the rear height of the residences.

Comm. Spokely asked about the PCWA letter regarding zero discharge to their drain.

Planner Lowe explained that the intent is that the water is to be pumped back to the street.

Comm. Spokely asked for clarification of Exhibit D which addresses "Stormtech Units".

Planner Lowe suggested that further clarification of this be provided by the project engineer.

Comm. Thompson asked if the conditions imposed for the height of the rear of the homes will address the concerns raised at the last meeting for this project.

Planner Lowe replied that it should address the previous concerns. This plan allows for individual custom homes on the bluff lots. Staff will review any plans that are submitted for these homes.

Comm. Thompson asked for clarification of the fencing.

Planner Lowe replied that fencing is not required, and is at the discretion of the property owner. It can be at the rear of the property, or around the entire 120 feet of the property line.

Director Wong further explained that the only thing that staff can control is the height of the fence. A condition requires that if a fence is built along the rear of the property, it must be open wrought iron.

Comm. Worthington stated that she is concerned about the single point of access to the subdivision with a 24-foot street width. She'd like for the condition concerning the enclosure of rear decks to be more specific. She feels there are too many difficulties involved in this project, and that the concerns as previously expressed by the surrounding residents have not been addressed in the new proposal. She would like to see the construction staging moved further away from the existing condominium residents. She would like the construction begin date to be moved from May 1 to May 15. She would like it specified that a portable unit be utilized for the wastewater created by construction so that it can be transported outside of the city. She would like for the Architectural Review Committee to include a minimum number of persons. She suggested a representative

from the existing condominium community, as well as a representative of Vintage Oaks, and a representative of Southridge.

The applicant's representative, Marcus Lo Duca, 3300 Douglas Blvd. in Roseville stated that the previous project was revised to address the concerns raised by the Planning Commission, City Council and the neighbors. He provided a handout to the Commissioners which shows the number of changes which have been made to the previous proposal, and reviewed the changes. They have eliminated all deviations from city standards, specifically minimum lot sizes, setbacks and required street fronts. He stated that the Stormtech Units will not be interconnected from lot to lot. The project will have an enforcement mechanism for the drainage system. The applicant is agreeable to adding a condition that the maintenance and repair of the drainage system will be funded by a drainage maintenance agreement among lot owners. The applicant has agreed to a slight change in the lot line for David Armitage at 1124 Humbug Way. The height limitation of 45 feet which was previously mentioned is above existing grade. He spoke about the limitations for deck heights, retaining wall heights and restrictions for fencing. The applicant is in agreement with adding two seats to the Architectural Review Committee so the adjacent subdivisions can be included in the meetings. He pointed out that the applicant has voluntarily increased the side-yard setbacks beyond the city standard. They have worked very hard to address the drainage concerns. He mentioned the additional \$2000 to be collected from each home builder to provide additional funding for the city School Park Preserve. The proposal is for custom homes. The applicant is a custom-home builder and will be building some of the homes on these lots.

They have met with the neighbors over the last few weeks and have attempted to address all of the concerns of the neighbors. The previous conceptual drawing is misleading, and has been eliminated from this proposal. Because all of the homes are to be custom homes, there is no way to provide details of what the homes will look like. The architect and engineer for the project are in attendance at tonight's meeting. The applicant asks for approval of this project as presented.

Comm. Spokely asked if PCWA was in agreement with the drainage analysis.

Mr. Lo Duca replied that they have not heard from PCWA regarding the final drainage plan.

Comm. Spokely and Mr. Lo Duca discussed the drainage maintenance agreement. Mr. Lo Duca stated that it will be enforced by the Architectural Review Committee, and the CC&R's will contain a

condition allowing the committee the authority to administer the agreement.

City Attorney Michael Colantuono stated that the city's concern is that the drainage facility works and it is maintained so that it works. He advised that the CC&R language will be required to give the city the authority to do the maintenance and to send the association the bill. He advised the Commission that if they don't wish to insist on a Homeowner's Association, they should at least use the existing condition language to give the city this ability.

Mr. Lo Duca stated that the applicant agrees with giving the city the power, but not the requirement to enforce the agreement. The responsibility will remain with the lot owner.

Comm. Spokely asked how maintenance would be provided for the storm units.

Bob Barrett of 2940 Calle de Oro Court in Rescue, California, who is the project engineer, replied that there are a variety of options available including pre-filters that can remove the dirt and sediment. The system will require periodic cleaning. It is not uncommon for people to manually clean the systems out.

Comm. Spokely asked if the units will primarily be collecting water from year yards.

Mr. Barrett replied that the water will be collected from year yards as well as house drains on roofs that are too low to go into the street.

Comm. Spokely asked how this will be enforced once the lots are sold.

Mr. Barrett replied that this will be enforced when plans are submitted to the building department.

Planner Lowe indicated that this is addressed in Condition #40.

Attorney Colantuono added that any grading that requires a grading permit will be subject to staff's review. If a homeowner relandscapes in future years and the project is not reviewed by city staff, the method of enforcing will be via city Code Enforcement.

Comm. Spokely expressed his concern about access to the properties if code enforcement is needed.

Attorney Colantuono explained that legally, the city has the right to go onto the property. However, practically, the city would be reluctant to

use the police department for enforcement, unless there was imminent hazard.

Mr. Barrett responded to the question about the storm-drain lines, stating that a new storm-drain line will be installed, with stub-outs in place to be connected to.

Comm. Worthington asked for clarification that the Architectural Review Committee may have seven members.

Mr. Lo Duca replied that this is correct, and they will all have voting rights. This will not include a person from the Southridge subdivision because they feel that their concerns have been adequately addressed.

Comm. Worthington expressed her concern about the width of the street, and asked why they did not consider widening the street to 34 feet.

Mr. Lo Duca replied that the project is at 60% of allowed density of zoning. Since the improvements were already built, they determined that it would be more cost effective to utilize the existing streets.

Chrm. Smith asked for comments from anyone in favor of the project. There were none.

Chrm. Smith asked for comments from anyone opposed to the project.

Gary Targantos of 11070 Sunrise Ridge Circle in Auburn stated that he feels this is almost the same exact plan as previously proposed. He provided a history of the communication between the Vintage Oaks Homeowners Association and Mr. Lo Duca. He stated that the members of the Homeowner's Association were frustrated that the meetings took place so late in the process that they are left with unresolved concerns, including building specifications, drainage, the lack of a Homeowner's Association, street widths, related parking, and others. He also stated that they feel the proposed height of the homes is too great.

Robert Knepp of 1135 Lantern View Drive in Auburn lives in an existing townhouse built with the original plan. He would like for the original 1987 plan to be utilized. He said that the new plan doesn't appear to be much different than the plan proposed in 2006. He is concerned about access to the property if there was a fire.

Susan Jeffrey of 11085 Palomino Court in Auburn said that the back of her lot backs up against Lot #26 of the proposed subdivision. She is concerned about the water drainage since her property is lower than that of Lot #26. She wrote a letter to Mr. Barrett, to which she

received a response. She is afraid that what is proposed may not be enough to prevent a problem for her property.

Rodney Kihara of 1201 Vintage Way in Auburn expressed several concerns with regard to the drainage impacts from the Auburn Bluffs property to the Vintage Oaks subdivision. He had several questions about exactly what the plan entails and would like further explanation of the proposal. He is concerned about the need for sump pumps and retention basins. He is also concerned about access to the property by firefighters.

Bonnie DeWitt of 11050 Sunrise Ridge Circle in Auburn stated that she lives below the proposed project and is also concerned about drainage onto her property. Another concern is that the new homes will not be aesthetically pleasing considering the height and size of the homes that will be built on the lots.

John Steenkolk of 11100 Sunrise Ridge Circle in Auburn stated his concerns regarding aesthetics and drainage. Lots 1-12 will overlook his home. He is concerned about the height and size of the homes.

Gary Hughes of 11081 Sunrise Ridge Circle in Auburn said that he is concerned that the homes will be built on stilts. He asked if the drainage system fails, who would be responsible to repair it.

Karen Azama-Kihara of 1201 Vintage Way in Auburn read excerpts from the General Plan. She feels that the proposed plan is not in keeping with the goals and policies outlined in the General Plan.

Tim DeWitt of 11050 Sunrise Ridge Circle in Auburn stated that he is concerned about the unknowns of this project. He illustrated the maximum building height. The group of homeowners he has been involved with would like to see 30' between the homes on the bluff lots, and would be in agreement with homes clustered into groups of two.

Kathy Asbury of 11515 Sun Valley Place in Auburn questions how the Architectural Review Committee will maintain funding once the homes are built. She asked what the homeowners' motivation would be to fix a broken pump or drain that incurs damages to the property below.

Attorney Colantuono replied that whenever someone alters a natural pathway of water, if the property below is harmed by the property above it, the property owner below has the right to sue. The owner of the property above is responsible.

Ms. Asbury would like to know who is responsible for counting the money collected for the Architectural Review Committee. She stated that there has been a lack of communication between the developer and the existing homeowners.

John Dunlap of 10905 Sunrise Ridge Circle in Auburn said that the proposed project is visible from his back yard. He is concerned about the view he will have from his back yard. He is pleased to see a reduction in the height of the proposed homes.

Steve Koltvet of 1200 Bluffs Place in Auburn stated that PCWA has abandoned the canal and does not maintain it. In heavy rains it overflows and goes through the neighbor's yards.

Robert Knepp of 1135 Lantern View requested that the CC&R's be approved by the Vintage Oaks and Auburn Bluffs Homeowner's Associations.

Gwen Wallis of 10913 Sluicebox Circle in Auburn asked that the trees be considered so that the native oaks can be saved.

Chrm. Smith asked for the applicant to return to the podium for final comments.

Mr. Lo Duca said that the applicant plans to divide responses into three segments. The first will be the project engineer.

Bob Barrett responded to the drainage issues that were raised. Regarding the cost of maintenance, the fee amount would be set so that the anticipated costs of all the maintenance needed would be covered. The Architectural Review Committee would be enforcing the maintenance of the system, and would hire a company to perform maintenance. The pumps would be simple sump pumps. In the event of a power outage, one must bear in mind that the system has the capacity to store water. Unless there was a major storm, the stored water should be sufficient. He read Condition #40, which states: "for Lots 1-12, the maximum amount of roof drainage feasible, depending on the design of the individual residence, shall be directed to the storm drain system in the street". He proposes that wording be added to say: "25% of the roof drainage shall be directed to the storm drain system in the street". In this way, there would be no increase in water going down the hillside after development than goes down the hillside now.

Ron Lichau of 100 El Dorado in Auburn is the architect for the project. With the 24-foot height restriction in the front, and 20 feet away from the street, to obtain 25% of the roof drainage being directed to the street will require a lot of roof area. It will be a challenge to achieve this and have the homes all look different, but he feels it can be done.

Comm. Spokely asked how deep the system is on Lantern View Circle.

Mr. Barrett responded that it is probably 3 to 4 feet.

Comm. Merz asked if it was possible to have less than 25% roof drainage and still achieve the goal of less drainage down the hillside.

Mr. Barrett replied that the reason for the use of the wording "no less than 25%" is to eliminate a problem in the case of a power outage. In this case there would be no difference in the drainage whether the homes are built, or if the property is left as it is now.

Mr. Barrett went on to explain the reason the walls are shown on the plans. There will be adjustments to the exact locations of the walls. More detailed and precise improvement plans will be submitted and approved by the City engineer. He added that he worked with the Fire Chief for the locations of the fire hydrants.

Comm. Spokely asked what method will be used to get water into the detention tanks.

Mr. Barrett replied that pipes, and/or swales will be used.

Comm. Thompson asked if any of the walls could block the PCWA canal.

Mr. Barrett said no, that the closest wall would be 60 feet away from the canal.

Comm. Worthington mentioned the drawing she made showing the detention tanks in the format that she believes represents the independent drainage system, and asked Mr. Barrett if her drawing is accurate.

Mr. Barrett said it is accurate. He gave further explanation of how the system will work.

Comm. Thompson asked for clarification about the comment made that the homes could be up to 84 feet tall.

Mr. Lichau replied that he doesn't know where that figure came from. The maximum height would be 65 feet looking down on the building, and about as high as the Council Chambers ceiling looking up at it.

Comm. Spokely questioned whether some of the lots are actually buildable.

Mr. Lichau assured the Commission that they are all buildable lots, by terracing the homes down the hill.

There was discussion about this issue.

Attorney Colantuono suggested that Condition 7a, Height Limitation condition, include additional language (*in italics*) as follows: "In no instance shall the building height exceed 24 feet above the *existing* average elevation of the Lantern View Drive sidewalk".

Director Wong added that the purpose of the condition is to require that the homes be "stepped" down the hillside.

Mr. Lo Duca stated that he and the applicant have been working with staff in the last few days to address the comments that they had received. They compiled a list of "Proposed Revised Conditions", which he distributed to the Commissioners.

He reviewed the list with the Commissioners and staff. He also stated that they are agreeable to an addition to the fencing condition that any fencing beyond 120 feet from the front property line shall be required to include a gate.

Comm. Worthington requested that the gate be required to remain unlocked.

Comm. Worthington stated that she is interested in knowing the parking needs of the existing residents since this will also affect them. She is concerned that with the 24 foot street width this will create a hardship for them.

Mr. Lo Duca pointed out that the street width is actually 27 feet from curb to curb.

Comm. Merz stated that in his opinion this is a new project, and is much different than the last proposal.

Comm. Spokely stated that he is still concerned with the drainage issue.

Comm. Thompson asked for Public Works Director, Jack Warren to speak about the drainage.

Jack Warren, Public Works Director explained the normal State drainage requirement for developments. The normal condition is that after the development is finished, the run-off does not exceed the run-off that would have come off that site prior to the development. The

next step would be an ETL drainage study after the entitlement and improvement plans are obtained. This project is somewhat different in the amount of effort that has been taken to solve a lot of the problems that normally would be addressed at a later stage. The previously mentioned condition may help if enough of the home builders build their homes such that enough of the hard surface drainage goes to the street so that the post project situation doesn't exceed the pre-project situation, then it doesn't really matter if power fails, etc. He does not feel there is a need for the detention tanks and pumps, if the roofs on the homes are built so that the drainage is directed to the street.

Mr. Warren said that he has met with PCWA on several occasions regarding the Shirland Canal. He explained the details of the canal, and the options for possible drainage improvements there.

Comm. Worthington asked for Mr. Warren's opinion about the street width.

Mr. Warren replied that the street width is minimal, however if the fire marshal has approved it, then he will support it.

Director Wong added that although the street width is minimal, with parking on only one side, it meets the city standards.

Attorney Colantuono recommended the following changes to the conditions of approval (new text is shown in **bold**):

7a ii) Height Limitation: For residences on Lots 1-12, the maximum building height of any point on the building shall not exceed 45 feet measured vertically above the natural existing terrain directly below that point, **except in the first 46 feet at the front of the lot.** In no instance shall the building height exceed 24 above the **existing average elevation of the Lantern View Drive sidewalk at the front 46 feet of the individual lot.**

44b) The owners of Lots 1-10 shall be required to enter into a drainage system maintenance agreement to provide funding for the maintenance and repair of the bluff lot drainage system, including the costs of enforcement by the Architectural Review Committee against any bluff lot owner for failure to maintain and repair the system. This provision shall be included in the project CC&R's.

7.a.x.v.iv: No rear wall shall have a height exceeding 20 feet without significant articulation or architectural features such as roofs, decks and balconies.

7.a.x.v.x: All roofs shall have a pitch of 4:12 or greater.

7.a.x.v: The Vintage Oaks Home Owners Association **and the Auburn Bluffs Home Owners Association** will **each** have a voting seat on the **7-member** Architectural Review Committee for the Residences at Auburn Bluffs. **The ARC shall inform the initial purchasers of all lots in writing of the availability of use of facilities owned by the Auburn Bluffs Home Owners Association upon payment of fees established by that Association.**

In addition to Tree Permit Condition No. 5, any trees removed for the subdivision improvements and detention wall shall be mitigated at a ratio of 5 trees planted for each tree removed. Replacement trees shall be 15-gallon in size.

7.a.vii: For Lots 1-12, any fencing beyond 120 feet from the front property line shall be limited to open ornamental wrought iron type fencing with a black finish, with a maximum height of six (6) feet. **Such fences must include an unlocked gate to allow access to drainage facilities for maintenance. This provision shall be included in the project CC&R's.**

40. For the bluff lots (Lots 1-12), the maximum amount of roof drainage feasible, depending on the design of the individual residence, **and in no case less than 25% of the total roof drainage**, shall be directed to the storm drain system in the street. The remaining areas of roof shall drain to the slope in a manner subject to review and approval of the City Engineer.

Comm. Thompson **MOVED** to:

Adopt Resolution No. 08-01 to approve the Auburn Bluffs Subdivision and Tree Permit (Files SUB 07-3; & TP 07-13) as modified by the Planning Commission, which includes the following actions:

1. Adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration, prepared for the Tentative Subdivision Map and Tree Permit (SUB 07-3; & TP 07-13) as the appropriate level of environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Guidelines;
2. Adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP) implementing and monitoring all Mitigation Measures in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Guidelines;
3. Adoption of "Findings of Fact" for approval of the Tentative

Subdivision Map and Tree Permit (SUB 07-3; & TP 07-13)
as presented in the Staff Report; and,

4. Approval of the Tentative Subdivision Map and Tree Permit
(SUB 07-3; & TP 07-13) in accordance with the
"Conditions of Approval" as presented in the Staff Report
and as the City Attorney recommended they be amended.

Comm. Merz **SECONDED.**

AYES: Merz, Thompson, Chrm. Smith
NOES: Spokely, Worthington
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: None

The motion was approved.

**ITEM VI: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT FOLLOW-UP
REPORTS**

- A. City Council Meetings
No report.
- B. Future Planning Commission Meetings
There will be a joint meeting with City Council on
Tuesday, January 22, 2008 for the Baltimore Ravine
EIR. There will be a Planning Commission
meeting on February 5, 2008.
- C. Reports
None.

ITEM VII: PLANNING COMMISSION REPORTS

None.

ITEM VIII: FUTURE PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEMS

None.

ITEM IX: ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned Wednesday, January 16, 2008 at 12:45
a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Fraizer, Administrative Assistant